

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,270	02/24/2004	Joel Ruiter	66022-0030	3854
10291 7590 07/10/2006			EXAMINER.	
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC			CHEN, JOSE V	
39533 WOODWARD AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 140			ARTONIT	TATER NUMBER
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-0610			3637	

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/785,270 <sup>-</sup>	RUITER, JOEL			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	José V. Chen	3637			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Ap	<u>oril 2006</u> .				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ∑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,12-15,20-32 and 35-45</u> is/are reject	cted.				
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-11,16-19,33 and 34</u> is/are objected t	to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ul>					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/24/04.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)			

Art Unit: 3637

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of figs 9-10 claims 1-45 in the reply filed on 04/28/06 is acknowledged.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11, 20-25, 26-28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim(s) 11, 20, 24, 26, 30, fail(s) to recite sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define: 1) how the track cooperates with the fixed portion and material holder (wall and filed holder) (claims 11, 24); 2) the internal and external environments (claims 20, 25, 26, 30) so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 20, 25, 29, 30, 36, 37, 39, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fox. The patent to Fox teaches structure as claimed including

Art Unit: 3637

fixed portion(20), movable portion (20), storage device (22) including a material holder (top surface of 22), the material holder moving from a first covered position to a second uncovered position in conjunction with movement of the movable section, track (36).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 23, 35, 38, 40, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox. The patent to Fox teaches structure substantially as claimed, as discussed above. The use of a plurality of like structures used in the same intended purpose and environment, the use of pedestal desk structures would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art, are well known and commercially available, respectively, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Claims 4-7, 31, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Sargent. The patent to Fox teaches structure substantially as claimed as discussed above including a support holder, the only difference being that the material holder is not of flexible material. However, the patent to Sargent teaches the use of providing a flexible material support structure to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Fox to include a flexible material support, as taught by Sargent since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 16-19, 33, 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 21, 22, 24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 26-28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Morton, Vondree, Brenner et al, Sidor et al, St-Pierre, Miller et al, Kohner, Vonhausen et al, Kolavo teach structure similar to applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

Art Unit: 3637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-4000.

Jose V. Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3637

Chen/jvc 06-29-06